

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 134

EC 190 608

AUTHOR Crealock, Carol M.
TITLE A Profile Analysis of the Implementation of a Special Education Service Model by Teachers and Principals.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Board of Education Role; *Compliance (Legal); *Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Legal Responsibility; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS *Bill 82 (Ontario); Ontario

ABSTRACT

A 3-year study of the processes used to implement Bill 82 (an amendment to the Education Act that provides more effective education for special needs students in Ontario) was reported. Structured interviews were conducted yearly with 59 regular and special education teachers and 26 principals from 26 elementary and secondary schools under the jurisdiction of three school boards in Ontario. Implementation was evaluated along six dimensions of a special education service model: (1) identification and placement; (2) program planning and objectives; (3) program modification and implementation; (4) review of student placement and progress; (5) communication among relevant people (e.g., students, staff, parents, school board members); (6) evaluation of services. Major areas of improvement were reported in identification, referral, and assessment procedures, in the variety of resources and instructional strategies used, and in monitoring student progress after placement. Areas of concern focused largely on programming and evaluation. Positive changes over the 3-year period were said to be influenced by four factors: quality and experience levels of principals and teachers; the degree of school board effort to implement changes mandated by Bill 82; school size, or level (smaller, elementary schools had higher levels of implementation); and regular contact with special education students by principals and teachers. (JW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED274134

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

If this document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
If minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

A Profile Analysis of the Implementation
of a Special Education Service
Model by Teachers and Principals

Paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the American
Educational Research Association
in San Francisco, California
April, 1986

by

Carol M. Crealock, Ph.D.
Faculty of Education
The University of Western Ontario
London, Canada

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Crealock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

8090610
F0190608

A Profile Analysis of the Implementation of Special Education
Legislation by Teachers and Principals

ABSTRACT

This study reports the changes observed in principals, special education teachers and regular class teachers during a three year implementation period in the following areas: identification and placement of special needs students, program planning, modification and implementation, review of student placement and progress, communication among relevant people and evaluation of services. Results show significant changes in all skill and attitude areas with principals and secondary regular teachers demonstrating the most dramatic gains.

Introduction

Over the past decade, governments across North America have felt the need to provide more effective education for the special needs student. The passing of Public Law 94-146 (1975) in the United States which mandated appropriate programming for the handicapped provided a legislative precedent for educators and politicians; the concern of communities and families which was often expressed through parent support associations like the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, the Association for the Mentally Retarded, the Association for Bright Children, etc. brought the issue home to provincial and municipal leaders, the growing body of research on the inappropriateness of traditional programs in many cases heightened the concern of many Canadian educators (Goguen, 1980) and the grass roots concerns of teachers and students for a more comprehensive response to the special needs child added to the demand for a major review of current practice. The two major areas of review included equal access to education for all students and appropriate placement and program for special needs students.

In 1980 the Ontario government amended the Education Act in order to better recognize and serve children with special needs. Typically referred to as "Bill 82," this amendment placed specific demands on school boards for planning and service delivery that constituted major departures from current practice for some boards and relatively modest increments of change in a direction already being pursued by others. Implementation was to be phased in over a three year period, beginning September, 1982 and ending in June, 1985 at which point all boards in the province were expected to have full services available for all their special needs students.

A three year study of the processes used to implement Bill 82 by a sample of five school boards was initiated in 1982. The study was conducted by three teams of investigators each responsible for specific boards over the three year period. Each year, each team of investigators focused on a common core of research questions using similar methods; additional questions and methods unique to each team

and year were also pursued. For the most part, the first and third years of the study were most alike so that estimates of change could be made. Year two of the study incorporated the most diversity.

The framework used to guide the study was a model of the policy implementation process. This model was based, in part, on the Leithwood conceptualization of program implementation (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982) and on our own observations of the essential components of a special education service model.

The model recognizes two questions that have been considered fundamental in implementation research: "How does the implementation process differ over time?" and "What role is played by various individuals, groups and agencies during implementation and why?"

This paper will report on the findings from three school boards as they relate to practice and change over the three year implementation period among the teachers and principals involved in the study. At the school level, teachers and principals must work together to implement the policy change mandated by legislation if real improvements are to be made in the service to special needs students.

Principals need to provide motivation, direction and coordination roles in their schools (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982). They need to help teachers see how integration can work to the benefit of all and to provide ongoing support for the teacher's efforts. They need to know what is happening in the classroom and be willing and able to give the teacher feedback as appropriate. Principals also need to be willing to draft the goals and specific strategies for achieving them (with the teachers in the school) that will lead to successful programming for the special needs student. Their final role is to coordinate or provide for the coordination of the many activities, persons and goals that share responsibility for the exceptional student.

Both regular class and special education teachers share responsibilities for the special needs student. Their responsibilities include identifying students with special needs, providing initial remedial opportunities, recognizing the point at

which they need to call on specialists to provide a more complete understanding of the student, providing appropriate goals and programs to meet the individual needs of the student, evaluating the program and providing the support and encouragement necessary to maintain students working at potential. The degree to which regular class and special education teachers share this responsibility must be sorted out among the personnel involved. Both groups of teachers are responsible for maintaining appropriate records and sharing information among themselves and with involved others as necessary.

The Model

Six dimensions of a special education service model were identified which could be seen to describe the important aspects of the implementation model developed by the local school board and in use in each school. These dimensions are as follows: a) identification and placement; b) program planning and objectives; c) program modification and implementation; d) reviewing student placement and progress; e) communication among relevant people; and f) evaluation of services. Within each of these dimensions, several subdimensions were identified for teachers and principals. Figure 1 shows these subdimensions for each group on each of the six major dimensions. For teachers the subdimensions relate to how they actually provide services and to what they feel their role to be within the school while for principals, the subdimensions relate to their own performance and to their perception of the performance of the school as a whole.

Figure 1
Dimensions and Subdimensions of the Special Education Service Model

Dimension A: Identification and Placement	
Teachers	Principals
* 1. Identification criteria for referrals and modifications at school level following identification	* 1. Identification criteria and modifications at school level following identification
* 2. Nature of referral and assessment process	* 2. Nature of referral and assessment process

3. Participation in the referral process

Dimension B: Program Planning and Development of Objectives

Teachers

- * 1. Creating programs and monitoring progress
- * 2. Developing objectives for individuals
- 3. Long term goals for SE students

Principals

- * 1. Post placement monitoring
 - * 2. Objectives for the school
 - 3. Level of integration in the school
-

Dimension C: Program Implementation

Teachers

- 1. Individualizing instructional strategies
- 2. Criteria for strategy selection
- 3. Variety of strategies,
- 4. Classroom organization
- 5. Use of resources
- 6. Classroom management

Principals

- 1. Post placement programming and monitoring
 - 2. Staff involvement in implementation
 - 3. Providing staff with skills and knowledge
-

Dimension D: Student Placement and Progress Review

Teachers

- * 1. Post placement monitoring
- * 2. Recording and reporting progress

Principals

- * 1. Post placement monitoring
 - * 2. Record keeping
 - 3. Direct service to students
-

Dimension E: Communication with Relevant Others

Teachers

- 1. Communication with students
- * 2. Communication among others

Principals

- 1. Impact of Bill 82
- * 2. Communication with staff
- 3. Communication with community
- * 4. Communication with parents
- 5. Communication with superintendents
- * 6. Communication with other board personnel
- 7. Influence of principal on teacher orientation

Dimension F: Evaluation

Teachers

1. What is evaluated?
2. How are students evaluated?
3. Individualization of evaluation

Principals

1. Evaluation of delivery model in the school

Note: * indicates subdimensions common to both principals and teachers

Within each of these dimensions four levels of implementation were identified. At the first level implementation in the school, as described by the respondent did not appear to reflect the model intended by the Board as presented in its various documents, and this was labelled "Non Implementation." At the second level, some attempt was being made to approach the Board's intended model, but only in a haphazard fashion, this being labelled "Token Implementation." At the third level the intended model of the Board was apparently being met fairly well, but consisted of a "letter of the law" approach which did not essentially encompass the intended attitudes and orientations. This third level was labelled "Routine Implementation." At the fourth level the implementation in the school appeared to be as congruent with the Board model as possible in both spirit and letter, and this was labelled "Full Implementation."

Using this four level model all three years of teacher and principal responses were coded to give raw numerical values to each sub-dimension. Naturally this type of assignment of numerical value is somewhat dependent upon interpretation of responses given, and, of course, responses do not fall neatly into the given categories. The numerical values represent the closest approximation on the four-level scale which seems appropriate to each individual response. In each of the dimensions, sub-dimension scores were totalled for an estimate of level of implementation for that entire dimension.

Method

Sample

Figure 2 describes the sample of respondents from which the data were drawn.

Figure 2

Respondents Involved in the Study

Role	Sample Size
Total Teachers	59
Elementary Special Education	23
Elementary Regular	16
Secondary Special Education	10
Secondary Regular	10
Total Principals	26
Elementary	19
Secondary	7
Schools	26
School Boards	3

Between the first and third year, fourteen teachers changed schools. Seven were replaced by a teacher in a similar program in the same school while the other seven were followed to their new school. The majority (80.1%) of the teachers reported having had some formal training in special education. Every teacher interviewed reported having received some form of informal training in special education. All teachers had at least one special needs student in their classroom.

Approximately one third (31.6%) of the principals reported having taught special education students and the majority (78.3%) reported having received informal training or experiences pertinent to special education. There were special education personnel teaching in every school in the study.

Instruments

Both teachers and principals were interviewed two or three times during the study period with a structured interview. The questions included demographic information, the dimensions of the service model described earlier, and attitudes towards implementation of Bill 82. Each interview lasted between 1 1/2 to 3 hours and was conducted during the first term of each year.

RESULTS

Data were analyzed descriptively and through the use of the chi-square statistic. Responses to relevant subdimensions were coded according to the four levels of implementation described earlier. These were developed initially for each subdimension to correspond to the service plan developed by each board. Further analysis showed strong consistency among all three board plans however, so levels of implementation were collapsed across boards and data from all respondents were analyzed using the same dimensions descriptors.

Table 1 shows the levels of implementation observed in principals over the three year period. Changes in all areas are significant.

Table 1

Comparisons among Principal's Mean Scores on Six Dimensions of the
Special Education Service Model

Dimension	Year			χ^2 (df=3)
	1 (n=26)	2 (n=19)	3 (n=26)	
A	2.3	3.3	3.9	24.18 ****
B	2.8	3.2	3.6	12.79 **
C	2.4	2.7	3.5	15.14 **
D	2.3	3.1	3.5	13.19 **
E	2.8	3.2	3.5	8.08 *
F	2.6	2.8	3.3	10.97 *

Note. Maximum mean score is 4 and minimum mean score is 1.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ **** $p < .0001$

In year one the average principal was at a token level of implementation across all six service areas but by year three, he or she was almost at full implementation especially in dimensions A and B, identification and placement and program planning. Evaluation of the school model was still at less than optimal levels of implementation. Half of the principals are operating at a routine level where procedures were checked regularly for efficiency and objectives were evaluated infrequently according to intuitive criteria. Forty per cent were at full implementation where procedures are evaluated and updated constantly, objectives are evaluated according to specific criteria and there is on-going evaluation of the delivery system according to both intuitive and objective criteria maintained by the principal.

In Table 2, teachers' levels of implementation across the three years are shown.

Table 2

Comparison's Among Teacher's Mean Scores on Five Dimensions of the Special Education Service Model

Dimension	Year			χ^2 (df=3)
	1 (n=59)	2 (n=43)	3 (n=59)	
A	2.7	3.6	3.5	11.71 **
B	3.0	3.6	3.7	19.39 ***
C	3.0	3.6	3.6	10.46 *
D	2.7	3.0	3.2	16.08 **
E	2.8	3.6	3.3	10.64 *

Note. Maximum mean score is 4 and minimum mean score is 1.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Dimension F was not included in teacher analyses because of missing data.

These changes too are all significant with the major ones occurring between years one and two and maintenance or enhancement of the

changes occurring in year three. Teachers began at somewhat higher levels of implementation than principals but ended at comparable levels with special strengths noted in program planning and implementation.

When teacher responses at the elementary and secondary level are examined, the year three overall results are clearer. In Table 3 comparisons are made between the two.

Table 3

Comparisons Between Mean Scores on Five Major Dimensions of the Special Education Service Model

Dimension	Year One			Year Three		
	Elementary Teachers n=37	Secondary Teachers n=20	χ^2 (df=3)	Elementary Teachers n=37	Secondary Teachers n=20	χ^2 (df=3)
	$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$		$\bar{x}$	$\bar{x}$	
A	3.2	1.7	12.50 **	3.7	3.1	6.38
B	3.1	2.4	8.29 *	3.8	3.3	7.16
C	3.6	2.7	10.20 *	3.9	3.4	3.96
D	3.0	2.5	9.12 *	3.3	3.1	5.25
E	3.2	2.4	16.27 ***	3.4	3.1	3.03

Note. Maximum mean score is 4 and minimum mean score is 1
*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Initially secondary level teachers were at significantly lower levels of implementation than were elementary teachers on all dimensions but they made significant gains over the three year period. Although there are no longer significant differences between the two, secondary teachers still perform primarily at the routine level in identification, review and communication with significant others. At the identification level, this includes frequent referrals that are generally routed directly to the school team for a decision on formal

referral without much effort put into pre-referral modifications and emphasis is placed on completing the procedures and documentations rather than on individual needs. Post referral monitoring and record keeping at the routine implementation level involve teachers being primarily responsible but with assistance from the principal or special education personnel, reviews performed annually according to legal requirements, keeping mark books with samples of work and occasional anecdotal comments, filling out the usual reports and occasionally making an extra report to the parents or in-school personnel. Communication with students is through marks, reports, written and verbal comments, usually on a formalized basis while communication with others was generally done as required rather than in a spontaneous seeking out of opportunities to share information that characterized full implementation.

Table 4 shows the breakdown between regular and special class teachers. While special education teachers started out ahead of regular class teachers in all service areas, the differences were not so marked by the third year.

Table 4

Comparisons Between Regular and Special Class Teachers on Mean Scores on Five Major Dimensions of the Special Education Service Model

Dimension	Year One			Year Three		
	Regular Class n=26 $\bar{x}$	Special Education n=31 $\bar{x}$	χ^2 (df=3)	Regular Class n=26 $\bar{x}$	Special Education n=31 $\bar{x}$	χ^2 (df=3)
A	2.3	3.1	7.29	3.2	3.6	8.43 *
B	2.1	3.2	14.01 **	3.3	3.8	5.98
C	2.9	3.7	17.05 ***	3.5	3.9	6.36
D	2.5	3.0	6.6	3.2	3.3	3.69
E	2.5	3.1	9.05 *	2.9	3.6	13.57 **

Note. Maximum mean score is 4 and minimum meal score is 1.

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Program implementation is strong among all teachers with performance characterized a) by an individualization of instructional strategies for all students in their classes, regular and special as far as possible in their circumstances, b) by choosing strategies to meet student needs and individual learning styles, c) by using as many strategies as appropriate, d) by allowing for flexible arrangements of furniture to facilitate student need, e) by both individual and group work and f) by clear philosophies of classroom management strategies which allowed for individual differences and personalities and in which discipline is, as far as possible, a private matter between teacher and student.

Both teachers and principals were asked about their own and each other's roles in implementing the special education service model. Tables 5 and 6 show their responses.

Table 5

The Role of the Teacher as Seen by Teachers and Principals

A. Teachers' View of His/Her Own Role (n=43)

Level of Response	1	Year 2	3
1. Don't know	7	2	0
2. Regular teaching, awareness of special needs students	7	6	2
3. Regular teaching, meeting IEP goals, working with team on development and review of program and placement.	3	27	40
4. Individualize teaching, program development and monitoring, liason with all involved	26	8	1

B. Principals' View of Teachers' Role (n=19)

Level of Response	1	Year 2	3
1. Teacher refers to team, is available to respond upon request	7	7	5
2. Teacher works on preparing case and on follow-up	8	9	7
3. Teacher is a key factor, involved at all stages	4	3	6

The teachers sense of their own role has changed. In the first year the majority of teachers responded at the fourth level, seeing the teacher as responsible for virtually the entire implementation process. In the second year the majority of teachers saw themselves as part of a team approach to implementation. By the third year this trend was fully established, and the greater majority of teachers described themselves and their tasks in this way. Breakdowns of responses show that special education teachers tended to respond at the fourth level in earlier years and have now, all but one, changed their descriptions, away from the tour de force to the team approach. Regular teachers, on the other hand tended to respond in earlier years at the first two levels, either unaware of their responsibilities or of the opinion that their task involved only awareness of special programs being taught by others, but by the third year had, all but one, changed their description also to the team approach.

Most principals also see the teacher as an essential part of the school team. Their sense of the teachers' role did not change very much over the three year period although there were some shifts. The largest number of secondary principals, however, still respond at the lowest level, wherein the teacher may identify a student but otherwise only responds to the actions of others, attending meetings as required and making any changes suggested by others. It would seem that the elementary teacher is perceived to have a more on-going involvement in the delivery of special education than is the secondary teacher, which would seem to be consistent with the relative size of the schools and the complexity of their organization.

Table 6

The Role of the Principal as Seen by Teachers and PrincipalsA. Teachers' View of Principals' Role (n=43)

Level of Response	Year	
	2	3
1. Don't know	1	0
2. He/she must reconcile this with everything else	1	0
3. Monitors teachers, programs and pupils	16	17
4. Supports teachers emotionally and materially, sets the school climate, supervises	25	26

Note. This question was not asked teachers in year one

B. Principals' View of their Own Role (n=19)

Level of Response	Year		
	1	2	3
1. Withdraws, keeps informed but not involved	2	1	1
2. Collegial, member of the team	5	4	2
3. Authoritarian, leads the team	5	0	1
4. Managerial, co-ordinates team, liases with everyone else	7	14	15

Table 6 shows teachers' and principals' perceptions of the principals' roles. There is not much overall change in the teacher's view of the principals' role between years two and three. Most responses are divided between the monitoring and supportive role. There have, however, been some interesting shifts within the sample. Elementary teachers tended to see the principal in the more supportive role in the second year, but a number had changed to perceiving a more monitorial role in the third year. On the other hand, secondary teachers tended to drift slightly in the other direction. This shift may be entirely random, or it may demonstrate changing stages of implementation through which the two levels are progressing at different rates.

Most principals see their role as largely a managerial one which is fairly consistent with the teachers' view. There is somewhat of a split however with all the elementary school principals seeing themselves in a managerial role but only one-third of the secondary teachers identify with that role. Half of the others report a collegial role while the other two report an authoritarian and withdrawn approach.

As Table 6 shows, there has been a tendency among principals interviewed in the three years to move away from the withdrawn role and towards the managerial role. When principal responses regarding role perception are compared with the overall level of implementation as described in the earlier section of this paper, a very strong correlation is found between the two variables. Principals who report a managerial role consistently score higher in implementation level, with an average level of 3.7, that is, very nearly full implementation. Principals reporting an authoritative role average 3.5, which is still approaching full implementation. Principals reporting a collegial role average only 3.0 in implementation, this being a routine level of implementation, in which procedures are followed but not with the intended spirit. Principals reporting a withdrawn style of role averaged only 2.8 in implementation level. It is quite probable that the managerial style of principalship is necessary for full implementation of the special education plan

intended by the Board, since it embodies all of the various tasks specified for the principal under the Board's plan. Whether the role preceeds the implementation is problematical: it is possible that they are in fact virtually measures of the same thing. It is clear, however, that the managerial model is appropriate and attainable at the elementary level, but appears to be less so at the secondary level.

Attitudes towards Bill 82 were seen as an important aspect of successful implementation of the special education service model. Both principals and teachers were asked about what they were concerned about and what they liked about Bill 82. Their third year responses are summarized in Table 7. Both groups spontaneously reported more likes than concerns.

Table 7
Concerns and Likes Regarding Bill 82

	Principals (n=19)		Teachers (n=43)	
	Number	Type	Number	Type
CONCERNS	22	1.Funding inadequate 2.Unreasonable time frame for implementation 3.Teacher training inadequate	16	1.Regular class teachers overloaded,too little support 2.Legislation being implemented to the 'letter' not not to the 'spirit' of the law 3.Inconsistent follow-up
LIKES	30	1.A more civilized approach to education *2.Raised awareness of everybody *3.Now giving to kids who need it	34	*1.Helps those who need it *2.Made teachers aware of social factors and individual differences 3.Gives parents rights

Note. * refers to commonalities between principals and teachers

Major concerns were consistent over the three years with one exception. In year one, 20 per cent of teachers were worried about the possibility of being required to integrate severely disabled students but by year 3 this fear was not mentioned at all.

Likes remained relatively consistent too over the three years. It is clear that both teachers and principals see a great deal to commend the legislation to them and are generally very supportive of its philosophy. One principal summarized the most common attitude, saying "This has made teachers see kids as their responsibility, not their problem."

DISCUSSION

There were major areas of growth for both teachers and principals reported over the three year study period. In terms of the special education service model dimensions themselves, these include:

1. Identification procedures and pre-referral interventions have developed over the three years from a rather haphazard system into a coherent structure.
2. Referral and assessment procedures have become much more consistent with the system model.
3. Integration models in individual schools have changed to reflect the higher emphasis on integration according to individual strengths and needs.
4. Both the criteria used in the selection of resources and the variety of resources used have improved greatly over the three years as has the variety of instructional strategies used and the individualization of teaching strategies.
5. Staff involvement in the implementation of the legislation has improved steadily over the three years with both teachers and principals seeing themselves as part of a team approach in their schools.
6. Monitoring of student progress after placement has improved greatly in three years as have procedures for recording and reporting student progress. This is especially notable at the secondary school level.
7. Communication with students, especially among secondary teachers, has changed during the study to include much more frequent informal discussion about student progress.

For teachers themselves, several specific changes have been noted. Two aspects of classroom climate, these being organization of the physical aspects of the classroom and the teacher's approach to management of student behavior, have both shown significant change towards more flexible and student-centered approaches. This change has been especially notable among secondary regular teachers.

Teachers' perceptions of their own role in delivery of special education have changed. Whereas special teachers tended to feel that they were all alone in providing special education and regular teachers tended to agree with that view, both groups have shown a change to a perception of themselves and each other as part of a team approach to the delivery of special education.

And finally, teachers in this sample were much more positive about the effects of Bill 82 in their schools at the end of the study than they were at the beginning. This is supported further by the decrease in concerns about the legislation and concurrent increase in enthusiasm about its benefits.

There were several changes specific to principals noted also. They are now coming into direct contact with special students much more often and much more deliberately. Communication with the community in general and other agencies in particular has improved a great deal as has communication with parents and interaction with superintendents. In addition, the principal's own understanding of how his orientation influences his teachers has increased, particularly at the secondary level.

There continues to be areas of concern however. These are noted most strongly in the areas of programming and evaluation. For teachers, although growth has been observed in the area of programming, this growth still falls short of being close to full implementation of the intended model. Some teachers express concerns about the quality of programming for special students, particularly the breadth of curriculum available to them. This is entirely consistent with a concern which was noted among principals in their interviews. Secondary regular teachers are still noticeably behind all other groups in their selection of teaching strategies, both in

terms of the variety of strategies in use and the way in which they are chosen.

Evaluation criteria generally seems to be inconsistent. The evaluation of students for credits in segregated secondary schools is clearly a problem. With the introduction of the new secondary school regulations, this may be more complicated than ever at this time. However, this problem was stated most emphatically as one which creates difficulties for teachers.

For principals an area which did not change much overall in the three years but which did show improvement between the second and third years and thus may be just beginning to develop is that of evaluation of the delivery model. This, however, seems to be dependent upon individual schools and somewhat lacking in system direction.

In conclusion, it seems appropriate to comment on what seemed to influence the changes noted over the three year period.

Certain characteristics of the principals and teachers themselves seem to have made a slight difference in the early implementation of the model. Those with higher qualifications and those with special education teaching experience had a head start on others in the first year of the study, scoring higher on implementation levels at the very beginning. This advantage however was greatly reduced by the second and third years. Secondary regular teachers are still somewhat behind the other groups but they too made gains.

A second general reason for the observed changes seems to be related to the school board's total concerted effort to implement the changes mandated by Bill 82. This was most obvious through the introduction of procedures and in-service development that were provided during the period.

A third factor affecting implementation has been that of school size, or level. Although the two factors were encoded separately, results seem to indicate that for all intents and purposes they might be considered to be virtually the same factor: elementary schools tend to represent smaller schools and secondary schools tend to

represent larger schools. Significant differences in level of implementation were found in five out of six dimensions based on this factor. Elementary schools were found to have started out at a higher level of implementation and to have improved their level faster than did secondary schools. Clearly it was much easier for elementary schools to implement this model. However, in the final year of the study this difference has decreased: secondary schools are now beginning to catch up with elementary schools.

The final factor influencing changes in implementation appears to be contact with special education students. For principals and most of the teachers interviewed, it would appear that it is the regular day-to-day contact with special students which changes hostile or neutral attitudes more often than anything else. It might not be overly optimistic to hope that this same contact - getting to know special students as individuals rather than statistics or problems - will eventually have the same effect on regular teachers and other individuals who have not as yet come into such close contact as principals have, and who may still harbour hostile or ambivalent attitudes towards these students.

REFERENCES

Education Amendment Act (1980). Toronto: J.C. Thatcher, Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Leithwood, K., and Montgomery, D.J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvements. Review of Educational Research, 52, 309-339.

THIS PAPER IS PART OF A LARGER PROJECT DESIGNED TO STUDY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BILL 82 IN ONTARIO. IT WAS SUPPORTED THROUGH MINISTRY OF EDUCATION GRANTS-IN-AIDE FUNDING TO THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION.